

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE
TO: <i>EO/DDA</i> <i>[Signature]</i>		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	<i>7 JUN 1985 1530</i>
REMARKS: <i>ADDA</i> <i>[Signature]</i> <i>6 JUL 1985</i> <i>DDA</i> <i>[Signature]</i> <i>Registry for filing</i>		
FROM:		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION

FORM NO. 241 1 FEB 66 REPLACES FORM 36-8 WHICH MAY BE USED. (47)

The Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

Washington, D.C. 20505

DD/A Registry
85-2038

Executive Registry
85-2250/1

6 June 1985

NOTE FOR: Chief, Psychological Services Division
Office of Medical Services

Bernie:

Appreciated your suggestion for improving
Agency selection processing. I have passed it
on to Bob Magee and asked him to get together
with you to see if he can work something out.

/S/ John N. McMahon

John N. McMahon

cc: ExDir
DDA
D/Pers

DDA REGISTRY
20-1

☒ UNCLASSIFIED☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Executive Registry

85-2250

FROM

C/PSD/OMS
706 C of C Building

EXTENSION

NO. 1

DATE

21 May 1985

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. AD/MS

5/21/85

No. 5

The proposal attached is submitted for consideration under the terms of your "Pursuit of Excellence" Program.

2.

3. DDCI

4.

5. DCI

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Attac

FORM
3-62

610

USE PREVIOUS
EDITIONS☐ SECRET☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY☐ UNCLASSIFIED

21 May 1985

SUBJECT: A Proposal Focused Upon Possible Improved
Efficiency In Agency Selection Processing

COMMENTS:

The observations which follow draw upon data recording systems which are not standarized in terms of time base-lines (FY vs. CY data) or most importantly in terms of definition of "who is an applicant?" In the present proposal, every attempt has been made to standardize data reporting.

While several data points may not agree perfectly with office statistics of record, the data cited are sufficiently accurate for identifying several principles which negatively influence Agency selection processing.

PRINCIPLE I

As gross numbers of applicants presented for Agency selection processing increase, the proportion of applicants found "unsuitable for employment" increases disproportionately both at the level of the earliest legitimate screens (PATB Testing) as well as at the level of the final (most expensive to the Agency) Headquarters screens.

DATA POINTS

EARLIEST LEGITIMATE SCREENS (PATB TESTING)

		<u>FY82</u>	<u>FY83</u>	<u>FY84</u>	<u>EST. FY85</u>
STAT	Numbers Tested				
STAT	"Not Recommended for Further Processing"				

FINAL SCREENS (HEADQUARTERS PROCESSING)

		<u>FY82</u>	<u>FY83</u>	<u>FY84</u>	<u>EST. FY85</u>
STAT	Numbers Processed				
	Numbers Rejected				

(*Raw numbers provided are based upon extrapolations from the first half of FY85 processing activities.)

The reader is cautioned not to compare/contrast "PATB Testing" data directly with "Final Screening" data. First, no clerical level applicant placed into "Headquarters Screening" has completed the PATB (clerical applicants represent about 1 in 3 of all "Headquarters Screening" applicants). Second, of all Professional Level applicants who reach "Headquarters Screening, at least 1 in 5 have not passed through the PATB early screen. All of these cited facts warn against highly detailed analyses of available data.

In spite of the disparities in collection problems cited, present data support the contention that the number of identified "unsuitables" (early and late screens) increase at a rate greater than the rate of applicant input to the system.

PRINCIPLE II

The human resource cost to the system to accomplish a "discontinue processing" action during final (Headquarters) screening is at least twice that of the cost to accomplish "approved for Agency employment" during final screening.

PRINCIPLE III

To the extent it is possible to define a pool of applicants identified as "Most Likely to Succeed" (MLTS) in terms of Headquarters Processing, to that extent the Agency can anticipate:

1. a greater proportion of "Approved for Employment" among Headquarters processed applicants, and
2. a more efficient time and personnel concentration of resources in the selection processing system since processing of MLTS candidates (Fast Track) requires 50% or less effort than processing of Slow Track applicants.

SPECIFIC PROPOSAL

It is proposed that groups of senior representatives of OMS, OP and OS be constituted to review completed applicant files. It would be the task of these groups to sort all applicant files into the MLTS category (Fast Track) or into the "Default" category (Slow Track) based upon the combined judgment of the group (a judgment executed prior to review of the materials by the Expediter group).

Once an applicant is categorized as MLTS, he/she would be given priority in terms of Headquarters processing. (If and when there is a dearth of MLTS candidates in the system, the "Default" candidates would be assigned Headquarters processing slots.)

SUPPORT DATA

For years Selection Support Branch (Applicant Psychiatric Screening) has reviewed applicant files data with the Expeditors (file review of at least 50% of all applicants who eventually reach Headquarters Final Processing). Based on these file reviews, Selection Support Branch (SSB) identified MLTS and two levels of "Default" or "Least Likely to Succeed." Of the MLTS adjudged (SSB) cases, 100% were approved for employment. Of the two levels of "Default" (SSB) adjudged cases, 20% (1 in 5) were eventually excluded from Agency employment either by virtue of a Medical/Psychiatric Disqualification or by virtue of an Applicant Review Panel (ARP) vote recommending rejection to D/OP.

CONCLUSIONS

It is possible, through careful review of applicant files by veteran representatives from OMS, OP and OS, to sort all applications into MLTS and "Default" categories.

It is suggested that a Senior Review Group (SRG) be formed to sort applicant files into MLTS vs. "Default" (Fast vs. Slow Track).

It is further proposed that all SRG files sorted into the MLTS category be given priority processing. After all currently available MLTS applicants have been assigned Headquarters Processing "slots", then (and only then) should "Default" category applicants be assigned. (It is reasonably assumed that OP and OS also possess criteria for evaluating applicant cases in terms of MLTS vs. "Default.")

COMMENTARY

While it would be desirable to totally reject "Default" cases and to process only MLTS cases, the data base does not support such action.

What the data base does support is some action (using the expertise of the SRG) to identify the MLTS's vs. the "Defaults" in order to boost the efficiency of the present selection system while preserving our processing resources.